



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,089	01/28/2004	Arno D. Bruns	08020.0011-00000	9826
60668 7590 04/12/2011 SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER				
THOMPSON, MICHAEL M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/12/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/765,089

Applicant(s)

BRUNS, ARNO D.

Examiner

Michael M. Thompson

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27, 29 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27, 29-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-040)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/30/2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-4, 6, 8-15, 17, 19-25, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 2004/0225507) in view of Wilson et al. (US 2002/0133387).**

4. With respect to Claims 1, 12, 23, 24, 25 and 30: Smith discloses the use of a method, system and a computer readable medium with instructions to configure a processor to perform functions for planning a delivery of at least one good comprising:

- a. receiving a sales order with a description of a good, the location of the good and requested delivery date (Paragraph 0017);
- b. selecting a selected source location for the good (Paragraph 0020, Smith discloses determining which supplier is associated with the order, therefore the examiner considers this to be selecting the source location of the good) and an origin of the good/supplier (Paragraph 0030);
- c. determining a set of trips based on a set of geographic routes, transportation service provider information, and scheduling information (Paragraphs 0024 and 0025, ship schedules from each supplier are received, in order to determine the delivery date. The examiner considers this to be a set of trips);
- d. selecting a trip from the set of trips based on a set of criteria (Paragraph 0024); and
- e. scheduling the trip such that the good is scheduled to be delivered from the source location to the destination location substantially close to the requested delivery date (Paragraph 0004 and 0034).

5. Smith discloses selecting a source location for the good which includes the supplier and the good origin, however discloses it is based on the date the goods leave the source, not the availability dates of the good at a set of source locations comprising

origins, and does not disclose it is determined independently of the requested delivery date, selecting from a set of source locations and does not specifically state the scheduling of the trip is based on the requested delivery date. Wilson discloses a supply chain management system which discloses determining if the particular requested items are in stock with delivery dates, the system then holds the item for the customer to complete the purchase. Wilson discloses if the item is available based of availability dates, then it chooses the source location from a set of source locations based on the availability dates and schedules the delivery to ensure the requested delivery date is met (See Figure 5A with corresponding detailed description for the proposition that the diagram also shows selection from several locations/availability before selecting; as well as Reference Numeral 160, and 510 with corresponding detailed description and Paragraphs 0034-0041). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Smith to include selecting the source location from a set of locations based on availability dates (i.e. from subsequent locations) in order to allow for the warehouse that is the best equipped to handle an order according to the customer's wants and needs to be used, in order to increase customer satisfaction and to ensure customer's needs are being met (See Wilson, Pages 1 and 2).

6. With respect to Claims 2 and 13: Smith discloses determining a set of trips comprises selecting one or more geographic routes from the set of geographic routes (See Table 1, Page 3).

7. With respect to Claims 3 and 14: Smith discloses selecting one or more geographical routes comprises restricting the set of geographical routes based on a geographical classification for the source location and the destination location (Paragraph 0026, Smith discloses using zones, which the examiner consider to be geographic classification).
8. With respect to Claims 4 and 15: Smith discloses determining a set of trips comprises selecting a transportation service provider for each geographic route (Paragraph 0024).
9. With respect to Claims 6 and 17: Smith discloses the set of criteria comprises at least one criterion representative of closeness of a trip delivery date to the requested delivery date (Paragraph 0034).
10. With respect to Claims 8-10 and 19-21: See Wilson, Figure 5A with corresponding detailed description.
11. With respect to Claims 11 and 22: See Smith Paragraph 0034 and 0035.
12. With respect to Claim 29: See Smith Paragraph 0037.
13. With respect to Claim 27: Smith and Wilson disclose the use of selecting a delivery date, however fails to disclose the customer indicating it is a rush order and scheduling for the rush order. The examiner is taking official notice that the use of Rush orders are well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. This is done when ordering same day service, or rush print jobs, or even when ordering express delivery for commercial carriers, and the rush order delivery date is scheduled there with. If the order is a rush order, Smith discloses planning for order, therefore obvious that Smith

would plan for rush order. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Smith and Wilson, to have the user indicate the order is a rush order and schedule accordingly.

14. Claims 5, 7, 16, 18 and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. and Wilson et al. in further view of Arunapuram et al. (US 2002/0019759).

15. Smith discloses the use of trip schedules, however fails to disclose eliminating the trip schedules or selecting a trip based on dangerous goods or cost information. Arunapuram discloses the use of shipping orders, where a set of trips for a shipping order are set, and a trip is selected based on things such as cost and whether the items are hazardous material (See Arunapuram, abstract and Paragraph 0055). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Smith, to have the optimal trip selected, based on criteria, such as hazardous material and cost, as disclosed by Arunapuram, in order to provide an optimum solution based on the customer's needs (See Arunapuram, abstract and Pages 1 and 7).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 2/3/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

17. With respect to Applicant's argument that Smith and Wilson fail to teach every element of every claim, particularly the limitation "determining, by a source, availability

dates of the good at a set of source locations comprising origins for the good" and "selecting a selected source location, by a planner module, from the set of source locations based on the availability dates of the good at the set of source locations...", as pointed out above, these limitations are taught by the secondary reference Wilson. Wilson discloses determining a source location from a set of locations and origins (i.e. various locations) which is closest to the destination. Figure 5 and accompanying description shows the selection from a set of locations. The system then determines if the item is "in stock", If the item is in stock it is considered to have an availability date of the current days date from such locations. Therefore Wilson determines the availability date from a set of locations. If the item of Wilson is in stock and the warehouse can fulfill the requested shipping details (such as things like gift wrapping), then the item is put on reserve for the customer, then the customer completes the order for shipping. The applicant has argued that Wilson does not disclose selecting a warehouses, however the way Wilson works, is the closest warehouse is determined, the items of Wilson are determined to be in stock (which the examiner considers, availability dates), and if they are, that warehouse is selected, if not then another warehouse is determined until one is found which has it in stock. Therefore it is the examiner's position that Wilson does in fact disclose determining based on availability from a set of locations before one is actually selected.

18. The applicant is arguing the remaining rejections based on Wilson not disclosing the above mentioned limitations. It is the Examiner's position that Wilson and Smith discloses all claim limitations, therefore argument is not considered persuasive.

Conclusion

19. The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record, within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL M. THOMPSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3605. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30 - 6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jamisue Plucinski can be reached on (571) 272-6811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael M Thompson/
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/Jamisue A. Plucinski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629